Null models for Dunbar's circles

Manuel Jiménez-Martín,[1,*] Ignacio Tamarit,[2] Javier Rodríguez-Laguna,[1] and Elka Korutcheva[1]

[1] *Dpto. Física Fundamental, UNED, C/ Senda del Rey 9, 28040, Madrid, Spain*
[2] *Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Grupo Interdisciplinar de Sistemas Complejos (GISC), Departamento de Matemáticas, 28911 Leganés, Madrid, Spain*

(Dated: February 14, 2017)

An individual's social group may be represented by his ego-network, formed by the links between the individual and his acquaintances. Ego-networks present an internal structure of increasingly large nested layers of decreasing relationship intensity, whose size exhibits a precise scaling ratio. Starting from the notion of limited social bandwidth, and assuming fixed costs for the links in each layer, we propose two statistical models that generate the observed hierarchical social structure. Both the micro-canonical and grand-canonical ensembles are equivalent in the thermodynamic limit, where the specific layer sizes are Poisson variables. In our setting, we further show that the number of configurations exhibiting such hierarchical organization is dominant. This result suggests that, if we assume the existence of layers demanding different amounts of resources, the observed internal structure of ego-networks is indeed a natural outcome to expect. We also find that, under certain conditions, equispaced layer costs are necessary to obtain a constant group size scaling. Finally, we compare the models with an empirical social network.

arXiv:1701.07428v2 [physics.soc-ph] 12 Feb 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

The computational capacity to store and manage an ever-changing social network is thought to depend roughly on neocortical size, which evolved driven by the need of managing increasingly large social groups [1]. This is the statement of the far reaching *social brain hypothesis* [2], which links brain volume in humans, primates and other mammals with the size of their social groups. For humans, the Dunbar's number constitutes an upper limit of ∼150 for the social group size. That is, the total number of active relationships that we can maintain at any given time; a cognitive constraint that seems to operate also in virtual environments, such as Twitter [3]. Certainly, to monitor and handle social ties comes at a cost, it takes time to cultivate these relationships [4], and the process is limited by cognitive constraints, such as memory and mentalising skills [5]. Current sociological studies rely on large digital datasets in order to build weighted networks of human relationships, where link weights encoding actor-to-actor interaction frequency are used as a proxy for emotional closeness [6, 7]. In this framework, an individual's social group is equivalent to its set of neighbors, which is often called its ego-network.

Ego-networks are internally highly structured and their links can be sorted by their weights [8]. Moreover, links can be clustered into groups of increasing number of links and decreasing emotional closeness [9]. These layers form a nested hierarchy, where the cumulative sizes of consecutive groups follow a preferred scaling ratio of approximately 1/3, forming a sequence of typical group sizes of 5, 15, 50 and 150, which are sometimes called Dunbar's circles. A smaller inner layer of size 1.5 [10], and two larger groups of sizes ∼500 and ∼1500 [11], have also been reported. In each case, the scaling relationship between consecutive groups holds. This hierarchical structure appears to be a fundamental organizational principle of human groups, and has been confirmed in online games [12], online social networks[13, 14] and telephone call detail records [15].

While several null models suitable for weighted social networks have been proposed recently [16–18], no such models have yet been proposed to analyze the observed ego-network hierarchical structure. In this paper, we propose a micro-canonical and grand-canonical ego-network statistical ensembles that reproduces qualitatively the hierarchical structure, and is able to fit experimental data successfully. We simplify the problem by assigning the ties in each layer constant costs and postulate an abstract social capital [19], or resource, that is spent in placing the links into the different layers. Then, by fixing the actors total degree and resource, the hierarchical structure emerges spontaneously. These ensembles are unbiased null models for ego-networks, which offer a parsimonious explanation for the nested structure. They can also be used to generate synthetic data with the desired layer scaling, as well as for hypothesis testing against more complex models. The formalism for a single actor is a micro-canonical ensemble, which is presented in section II. Here we also prove that, in our setting, equispaced costs are a condition for a constant group size scaling in the outer layers. Individuals within groups of many actors with given average degree and resource are modeled with a grand-canonical ensemble, which is presented in section III. Both ensembles are found to be equivalent on the thermodynamic limit. We fit and compare the models to an empirical dataset in section IV. Finally, section V is dedicated to the discussion.

*Electronic address: manuel.jimenez@fisfun.uned.es

II. MICRO-CANONICAL ENSEMBLE FOR DUNBAR'S CIRCLES

Let us assume that we have a total social resource, s, that we can employ to establish ties or relationships of different kind with our k acquaintances. We consider $r = 1, \dots, K$ different relationship layers with respective costs, $s_r \in \mathbb{R}$, with $0 \leq s_r \leq s$ and sorted such that $s_r > s_{r+1}$. We define the *layer-degree*, k_r, as the number of ties of cost s_r. The Dunbar's circles are inclusive groupings of decreasing emotional closeness, hence the group at level j includes all layers of cost $\geq s_r$. The *group-sizes* are thus defined as $n_r = \sum_{l=1}^{r} k_l$. We consider that the totality of our resource, s, is spent in the process. This can be expressed by the constraints

$$k = \sum_r k_r, \tag{1a}$$

$$s = \sum_r s_r k_r. \tag{1b}$$

Our system can take any state, $\{k_r\}$, that verifies the constraints Eqs. (1). The problem is equivalent to that of distributing k particles among K energy levels $\{s_r\}$ in a quantum micro-canonical ensemble [20]. The micro-canonical ensemble assigns an homogeneous probability distribution on the configuration space, hence the problem is solved if we are able to compute the volume of the configuration space, Ω. We may consider each of the k_r ties belonging to the layer of cost s_r as either being distinguishable or not. This choice will define the degeneracy of the configuration, and results in two different partition functions, Ω and Ω_{U}, respectively. Let us tackle here the distinguishable case, Ω, as each of our k ties represents a social relationship with an individual, which are distinguishable entities by almost all known legal systems and social conventions. The calculations for Ω_{U} are given in the appendix A.

$$\Omega = \sum_{\{k_r\}} \frac{k!}{\prod_r k_r!} \mathrm{e}^{\sum_r h_r k_r} \delta\left(s - \textstyle\sum_r s_r k_r\right) \delta\left(k - \textstyle\sum_r k_r\right). \tag{2}$$

The sum carries over k_r values from 0 to ∞, and the configurations not verifying the constraints Eqs. (1) are suppressed by the deltas. We have also introduced the auxiliary fields h_r, which allow us to compute the cumulants of the layer-degrees as

$$\langle k_r \rangle = \partial_{h_r} \ln \Omega\left(\{k_r\}\right)|_{h_r=0}, \tag{3}$$

$$\sigma^2_{k_r} = \partial^2_{h_r} \ln \Omega\left(\{k_r\}\right)|_{h_r=0}, \tag{4}$$

$$\sigma_{k_r,k_l} = \partial^2_{h_r,h_l} \ln \Omega\left(\{k_r\}\right)|_{h_r=0}. \tag{5}$$

In order to compute the partition function we use an integral representation of the Dirac deltas, which imply the introduction of two auxiliary parameters λ and μ. After some algebra we arrive to

$$\Omega = \int D[\lambda,\mu]\, k!\, \mathrm{e}^{-(\lambda k + \mu s)} \sum_{\{k_r\}} \prod_r \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(hr+\lambda+\mu s_r)k_r}}{k_r!} \tag{6a}$$

$$= \int D[\lambda,\mu]\, \exp\left\{\ln k! - (\lambda k + \mu s) + \textstyle\sum_r \mathrm{e}^{h_r+\lambda+\mu s_r}\right\}, \tag{6b}$$

where $D[\lambda,\mu] = d\lambda\, d\mu/4\pi^2$. We can approximate the integral by steepest descent leading to

$$\ln \Omega \approx \ln k! - (\lambda k + \mu s) + \textstyle\sum_r \mathrm{e}^{h_r+\lambda+\mu s_r}, \tag{7}$$

where the values of λ, μ are those maximizing the integrand, and can be obtained by solving the saddle point equations

$$\partial_\lambda \ln \Omega|_{h_r=0} = 0 \implies k = \sum_r \mathrm{e}^{\lambda+\mu s_r}, \tag{8}$$

$$\partial_\mu \ln \Omega|_{h_r=0} = 0 \implies s = \sum_r s_r \mathrm{e}^{\lambda+\mu s_r}. \tag{9}$$

Let us define the parameters $x = \mathrm{e}^\lambda$ and $y = \mathrm{e}^\mu$. The above expressions allow us to identify the layer-degree cumulants, consistently with Eqs. (3), (4) and (5).

$$\langle k_r \rangle = x y^{s_r}, \tag{10}$$

$$\sigma^2_{k_r} = \langle k_r \rangle, \tag{11}$$

$$\sigma_{k_r,k_l} = 0. \tag{12}$$

Hence, the layer-degrees are uncorrelated Poisson variables which are, however, related through the parameter y. We can identify y^{s_r} as the relative weight of each layer when writing the average link weight

$$\bar{s} = \frac{s}{k} = \frac{\sum_r s_r y^{s_r}}{\sum_r y^{s_r}}. \tag{13}$$

Thus, y relates the expected layer-degree scaling with the difference of the link costs: $\langle k_{r+1} \rangle / \langle k_r \rangle = y^{s_{r+1}-s_r}$. On the other hand, x is a volumetric parameter which fixes the total degree, $x = k/\sum_r y^{s_r}$.

Constant group size scaling condition

The expected group-size scaling, $\langle n_r/n_{r+1} \rangle$, defines the hierarchical social structure. This quantity is the quotient of two functions of the configuration variables and cannot be calculated analytically. Instead, we must approximate it in terms of $\langle k_r \rangle$, $\langle k_r^2 \rangle$ and $\langle k_r k_s \rangle$, as explained in the appendix B. The ensemble average is given by

$$\left\langle \frac{n_r}{n_{r+1}} \right\rangle = \frac{\langle n_r \rangle}{\langle n_{r+1} \rangle}(1 + \epsilon_{r+1}), \tag{14}$$

where ϵ_{r+1} is a second order correction term, which can be expressed as

$$\epsilon_{r+1} = \frac{\langle n_r\rangle\langle k_{r+1}^2\rangle - \langle k_{r+1}\rangle\langle n_r^2\rangle}{\langle n_r\rangle\langle n_{r+1}\rangle^2} = \frac{\langle k_{r+1}\rangle^2 - \langle k_{r+1}\rangle\langle n_r\rangle}{\langle n_{r+1}\rangle^2}. \tag{15}$$

The rightmost expression was obtained by using the identity for Poisson variables: $\langle k_r^2\rangle = \langle k_r\rangle + \langle k_r\rangle^2$.

Let us now consider the scaling of two consecutive group pairings $\langle n_{r+1}/n_r\rangle$ and $\langle n_r/n_{r-1}\rangle$. We will consider the implications of having a constant group-size scaling, such as observed in empirical relationship networks. Imposing $\langle n_{r+1}/n_r\rangle = \langle n_r/n_{r-1}\rangle$ we get

$$\langle n_r^2\rangle = \langle n_{r+1}\rangle\langle n_{r-1}\rangle R_r. \tag{16}$$

The correction factor, $R_r = (1+\epsilon_r)/(1+\epsilon_{r+1})$, tends to 1 provided that $\langle n_r\rangle \gg 1$. Indeed, this is a good approximation for the outer layers, as shown in the inset of Fig. 2. Considering $R_r \approx 1$, simple manipulations lead to

$$\left\langle \frac{n_{r-1}}{n_r} \right\rangle \approx \frac{\langle k_r\rangle}{\langle k_{r+1}\rangle} = y^{s_r - s_{r+1}}. \tag{17}$$

This result states that, in the micro-canonical ensemble, a constant group-size scaling in the outer layers is possible only if the cost difference between them is constant.

$$s_r - s_{r+1} = \Delta, \qquad (\text{for } r \text{ s.t. } n_r \gg 1). \tag{18}$$

III. GRAND-CANONICAL ENSEMBLE FOR DUNBAR'S CIRCLES

The micro-canonical ensemble considers constant degree, k, and resource, s. However, the degree and resource do vary across individuals in real datasets. We can formulate a grand-canonical ensemble [20], consisting on N individuals, or egos, each of which having different degree, $k^{(j)}$, and resource, $s^{(j)}$, but with given mean degree and resource. That is, the constraints Eqs. (1) are verified only on average

$$\langle k\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\textstyle\sum_r k_r^{(j)}\right) P(\{k_r\}), \tag{19a}$$

$$\langle s\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\textstyle\sum_r s_r k_r^{(j)}\right) P(\{k_r\}), \tag{19b}$$

The least biased distribution $P(\{k_r\})$ verifying the constraints Eqs. (19) can be calculated following a maximum entropy principle [21]. Maximizing the distribution entropy, $S = -\sum_{\{k_r\}} P(\{k_r\}) \ln P(\{k_r\})$, subject to the constraints Eqs. (19) plus normalization, we obtain a Gibbs distribution

$$P(\{k_r\}) = \frac{1}{Z} D(\{k_r\}) \mathrm{e}^{H(\{k_r\})}, \tag{20}$$

where $D(\{k_r\}) = \binom{N}{k} k!/\prod_r k_r!$ is the degeneracy of the configuration $\{k_r\}$, which counts all possible ways of selecting $k = \sum_r k_r$ links among N actors, and all ways of assigning k distinguishable links into layers of degree k_r. Finally, Z and H are the partition function and cost function, respectively.

$$Z = \sum_{\{k_r\}} D(\{k_r\}) \mathrm{e}^{H(\{k_r\})}, \tag{21}$$

$$H(\{k_r\}) = \gamma k + \nu s + \textstyle\sum_r h_r k_r, \tag{22}$$

where γ and ν are the Lagrange multipliers and will act as fitting parameters in order to enforce the constraints Eqs. (19). We have also included the auxiliary fields h_r for convenience. The maximum entropy method has been applied to formulate a large number of complex network models with prescribed features, known generally as exponential random graphs [16, 18, 22–24]. Our approach here seeks instead a probability distribution for ego-network configurations $\{k_r\}$. All the information of our system, including the cumulants of the layer degrees and group sizes, as well as their marginal distributions, are recovered from the partition function, which can be calculated analytically.

$$Z = \sum_{\{k_r\}} \binom{N}{k} \frac{k!}{\prod_r k_r!} \mathrm{e}^{\sum_r (\gamma + \nu s_r + h_r) k_r} \tag{23a}$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{N} \binom{N}{k} \sum_{\{k_r|k\}} k! \prod_r \frac{\mathrm{e}^{(\gamma+\nu s_r + h_r)k_r}}{k_r!} \tag{23b}$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{N} \binom{N}{k} \left(\sum_r \mathrm{e}^{\gamma+\nu s_r + h_r}\right)^k = \left(1 + \sum_r \mathrm{e}^{\gamma+\nu s_r+h_r}\right)^N. \tag{23c}$$

where the symbol $\sum_{\{k_r|k\}}$ on the second line denotes sums over configurations $\{k_r\}$ with total degree k. As usual, derivatives of the logarithm of the partition function give the ensemble cumulants. Analogous to Eqs. (10), (11) and (12), we can compute the layer degrees cumulants

$$\langle k_r\rangle = \quad \partial_{h_r} \ln Z \,|_{h_r=0} \quad = \frac{N z_r}{1 + \sum_s z_s}, \tag{24}$$

$$\sigma_{k_r}^2 = \quad \partial_{h_r}^2 \ln Z \,|_{h_r=0} \quad = \frac{1 + \sum_{s\neq r} z_s}{1 + \sum_s z_s} \langle k_r\rangle, \tag{25}$$

$$\sigma_{k_r,k_s} = \partial_{h_r,h_s}^2 \ln Z \,|_{h_r=0} = -\frac{\langle k_r\rangle\langle k_s\rangle}{N}, \tag{26}$$

where we have defined $z_r = \mathrm{e}^{\gamma+\nu s_r}$. Hence, in the grand-canonical ensemble the layer degrees are correlated and not poissonian. We will prove the equivalence of the micro-canonical and grand-canonical ensemble in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$ later on. Let us first write, however, the saddle point equations, used to fix the k and

s ensemble averages.

$$\langle k\rangle = \partial_\gamma \ln Z\,|_{h_r=0} = N\frac{\sum_r z_r}{1+\sum_r z_r}, \tag{27}$$

$$\langle s\rangle = \partial_\nu \ln Z\,|_{h_r=0} = N\frac{\sum_r s_r z_r}{1+\sum_r z_r}, \tag{28}$$

In our maximum entropy setting, Eqs. (27) and (28) are solved for γ and ν in order to obtain the parameter values that fix the desired $\langle k\rangle$ and $\langle s\rangle$.

Further derivations recover the subsequent k and s cumulants. For instance, the variances are

$$\sigma_k^2 = \partial_\gamma^2 \ln Z\,|_{h_r=0} = \frac{\langle k\rangle}{1+\sum_r z_r}, \tag{29}$$

$$\sigma_s^2 = \partial_\nu^2 \ln Z\,|_{h_r=0} = \frac{\langle s\rangle}{1+\sum_r z_r}. \tag{30}$$

Finally, we can write the configuration probability function, which may be sampled with Monte Carlo methods.

$$P(\{k_r\}) = \binom{N}{k}\frac{k!}{\prod_r k_r!}\cdot\frac{\prod_r z_r^{k_r}}{(1+\sum_r z_r)^N}. \tag{31}$$

Ensemble equivalence in the thermodynamic limit

Let us study the thermodynamic limit for the grand-canonical ensemble, that is when the number of ego-networks $N\to\infty$ while keeping $\langle k\rangle$ and $\langle s\rangle$ constant. From Eq. (27) we can write $\sum_r z_r = \langle k\rangle/(N-\langle k\rangle)$. This in turn, allows us to rewrite the partition function as

$$Z = \left(1+\frac{\langle k\rangle/N}{1-\langle k\rangle/N}\right)^N \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} \mathrm{e}^{\langle k\rangle} = \prod_r \mathrm{e}^{\langle k_r\rangle}. \tag{32}$$

The expected layer degrees can be expressed as $\langle k_r\rangle = z_r(N-\langle k\rangle) \cong z_r N$, for which it is needed that $z_r\to 0$ as $N\to\infty$. Then, the configuration probability distribution Eq. (31), reduces to

$$P(\{k_r\}) = \frac{N^{-k}N!}{(N-k)!}\prod_r \frac{\langle k_r\rangle^{k_r}}{k_r!}\mathrm{e}^{-\langle k_r\rangle} \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} \prod_r p_r(k_r), \tag{33}$$

where the prefactor tends to 1 as $N\to\infty$, for finite k. Indeed, using Stirling's approximation and the exponential limit

$$\frac{N^{-k}N!}{(N-k)!} \cong \mathrm{e}^{-k}\left(\frac{N}{N-k}\right)^{N-k} \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} 1. \tag{34}$$

Thus, the layer degree marginal distributions are Poisson distributions.

$$p_r(k_r) = P(k_r|N,z_r) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{Nz_r}}{k_r!}(Nz_r)^{k_r}. \tag{35}$$

global stats.		layers	s_r	$\langle k_r\rangle$	σ_{k_r}	$\frac{\langle k_{r-1}\rangle}{\langle k_r\rangle}$	$\langle n_r\rangle$	$\left\langle\frac{n_{r-1}}{n_r}\right\rangle$
N	84	$r=1$	5	2.93	3.49		2.93	
$\langle k\rangle$	73.63	$r=2$	4	3.68	3.30	0.80	6.61	0.39
σ_k	17.17	$r=3$	3	9.50	6.04	0.39	16.11	0.40
$\langle s\rangle$	145.45	$r=4$	2	30.07	16.78	0.32	46.18	0.37
σ_s	42.71	$r=5$	1	27.45	15.81	1.10	73.63	0.61

Table I: Global statistics and layer structure of the Reciprocity Survey dataset network [25].

It is trivial to see that Eqs. (24), (25) and (26) reduce to the micro-canonical cumulants, Eqs. (10), (11) and (12), when $N\to\infty$. Moreover, noticing that $\sum_r z_r\to 0$, we can see that Eqs. (27) and (28) reduce to the micro-canonical saddle point equations (8) and (9) by identifying $N\mathrm{e}^\gamma$ with x, and $\mathrm{e}^{\nu s_r}$ with y^{s_r}. Thus, the equivalence of both ensembles in the thermodynamic limit is made manifest. Hence, sampling from a grand-canonical ensemble in the thermodynamic limit corresponds to drawing independent random Poisson variables from the layer degree marginal distributions.

IV. FIT TO EMPIRICAL SOCIAL NETWORK

The statistical ensembles presented above may function as null models for ego-networks, providing a benchmark against which to test more complicated features. In order to accept an ensemble as a good model for social structure, the model should meet two demands: *(i)* It should generate ego-network instances with k and s values similar to the empirical ones (similar macrostate); and *(ii)* Those instances should present a nested layer structure. The assumption of constant layer costs makes the ensembles specially suited to model data from surveys, where the ties weights are chosen from predefined discrete scores or categories. We have fitted the grand-canonical ensemble to the Reciprocity Survey (RS) dataset [25]. In this experiment, a total of $N=84$ undergraduate students were asked to score their relationship with each of the other participants in a scale from 0 to 5, where 0 meant no-relationship, and 1 to 5 represented increasing degree of friendship. We have considered the zero weight as a no-link. Thus, the allowed layer costs are $\{s_1,s_2,s_3,s_4,s_5\}=\{5,4,3,2,1\}$, which verify the equispaced layer cost condition, Eq. (18). The global and hierarchical structure of the empirical network is summarized in Table I. The individual ego-networks show the expected Dunbar's structure, albeit with some remarks: By design, the total active network is incomplete as the maximum possible degree is limited by the total number of experiment participants, $k_{\max}=N-1$. Consequently, the outer layer degree, $\langle k_5\rangle$, departs from the expected scaling. However, all the participants belong to the same course and live in the same campus, hence we can expect that a significant fraction of their actual social net-



Figure 1: Contour plot for the joint log-density of states in the k-s space for the grand-canonical ensemble with parameter values $\gamma = 1.8858$ and $\nu = -0.5842$. The red diamonds correspond to the dataset individual ego-networks and the red cross marks the empirical averages. The lines $s = k$ and $s = 5k$ delimit the configuration minimum and maximum allowed total weight, respectively.

work is captured by the experiment. Indeed, the inner groups show an almost constant ratio of approximately 0.4, which is consistent with the ratio of $\sim 1/3$ reported by larger scale studies [10, 13–15]. The degree distribution is peaked close to the number of participants, with low variance. The weights distribution, however, is more spread-out.

We have fitted the grand-canonical ensemble to the observed data, by substituting the mean values of $\langle k \rangle = 73.63$ and $\langle s \rangle = 145.45$, along with $N = 84$; into Eqs. (27) and (28). Solving the saddle point equations numerically, we obtained the parameter values $\gamma = 1.8858$ and $\nu = -0.5842$. The resulting distribution, along with the data are shown in Figure 1. We have employed a Wang-Landau algorithm [26, 27] in order to compute the joint density of states in the k-s space (the macrostate space). This function is defined as $P(k,s) = \sum_{\{k_r\}} P(\{k_r\})\delta(k - \sum_r k_r)\delta(s - \sum_r k_r s_r)$, where $P(\{k_r\})$ is the grand-canonical probability distribution from Eq. (31). We have made available online a python implementation of the algorithm [33]. As can be seen on the figure, the presence of various outliers with very low k and s displaces the averages from the bulk of the distribution. Other than that, the probability distribution is a well behaved unimodal function, hence fulfilling our first demand, *(i)*.

Next, let us compare the RS layer structure with the layer structure generated by both the micro-canonical and grand-canonical ensemble. Figure 2 shows the empirical layer degree and layer group sizes distributions along with the ensemble averages. It is interesting how, despite the small size of the RS network, already the grand-canonical ensemble is barely distinguishable from the micro-canonical ensemble. Both ensembles average layer degrees and group sizes are equivalent, and only the variance of the outer layer degrees in the micro-canonical ensemble is slightly larger than its grand-canonical counterpart. Hence, we will refer subsequently to the ensemble, with no distinction between micro-canonical and grand-canonical. Observing the RS layer distributions we find that the empirical averages of the three first layers lie within one standard deviation of the ensemble expected values, both for degrees, k_r , and group sizes, n_r. On the other hand, the outermost layers degrees suffer from finite size effects. The discrepancy between ensemble and data is however corrected for the accumulated variables, n_r, which follow closely the ensemble scaling trend. Thus, condition *(ii)* is verified as well. In the thermodynamic limit we can identify the micro-canonical scaling y with the exponential of the grand-canonical parameter ν. Remarkably, the obtained value of $e^{\nu} = 0.56$ is comparable with the empirical group size scaling for the outer layers, $\langle n_4/n_5 \rangle = 0.61$. Indeed, the approximation from Eq. (17) is better for the larger outer layers, where the correction factor, R_r, tends to 1, as shown on the inset of Fig. 2.

V. DISCUSSION

We have proposed two statistical ensembles as null models for the hierarchical structure of social networks. The micro-canonical ensemble models a single actor with fixed degree and total social resource. The ensemble generates the observed nested structure of increasingly large layers of decreasing link weight. Moreover we show that, at least for the outer layers, a constant group size scaling between consecutive group pairings is possible only if the difference between costs of consecutive layers is constant. The grand-canonical ensemble models an individual's ego-network within a social group with given average degree and social resource. In the thermodynamic limit, that is, when the number of actors is large, both ensembles are equivalent and their layer degrees are uncorrelated Poisson variables, which are related through the group size scaling, y. Interestingly, a recent paper providing more evidence on Dunbar's theory further shows the good fit of Poisson distributions to the layer-specific degree distributions [28]. In the case of the dataset analyzed, we observe that for typical values of social bandwidth or resource, $\langle s \rangle$, and number of ties,$\langle k \rangle$, the configuration space region with the maximum number of microstates is found around layer degree values $\{k_r\}$ that verify the scaling relationship.

The proposed null models succeed at modeling survey social data, where the available categories could be directly used as representations of layers. However, in larger scale studies of ego-network social structure, layers are not given *a priori*, but rather *inferred* from the interaction patterns. The link weights represent frequency of interaction which acts as a proxy for emotional closeness, and ties are clustered into discrete groups according to these weights [10, 13–15]. It is important to assert



Figure 2: Layer degrees (top) and layer group sizes (bottom) distributions. The empirical RS distributions are represented by the black box-plots, where the box comprises the second and third quartiles, separated by the median line. The whiskers extend to the full distribution domain, and the averages are represented by the black diamonds. The dashed colored lines join the corresponding ensemble averages, $\langle k_r \rangle$ (blue, top), and $\langle n_r \rangle$ (red, bottom) from a grand-canonical (light-colored) and a microcanonical ensembles (dark-colored) which lay practically identical values. One standard deviation from the averages are represented by the shaded regions for the grand-canonical ensemble, and by the dotted lines for the microcanonical. The parameter values are $N = 83$, $\gamma = 1.8858$ and $\nu = -0.5842$; and $x = 61.76$, $y = 0.56$ for the grand-canonical and microcanonical ensemble, respectively. Finally, the inset shows the numerical value of the micro-canonical correction factor, $R_r = (1 + \epsilon_r)/(1 + \epsilon_{r+1})$, which tends to 1 for the outer layers.

that we do not identify our link weights with interaction frequency. Rather, we introduce the abstract notion of social resource, which can be spent in assigning discrete weights to the social ties. In order to justify this construction it can be argued that a limited social bandwidth may arise both from biological or temporal constraints, since maintaining a social relationship is costly [1, 3]. Nevertheless our models are agnostic regarding what the nature of that cost can be in either psychological or sociological terms. Another key ingredient of our models is the discrete nature of the layers. It is important to stress that it is not our intention to neither justify nor provide any sort of explanation to their existence. We rather rely on the existing literature, where these layers have been consistently identified and given specific names: the *support clique* of size ∼5, the *sympathy group* of size ∼15, the *affinity group* of size ∼50, and the total active network whose size equals the Dunbar's number, ∼150 [9]. Assigning those layers a constant cost is not only a convenient simplification, but has also a rather natural interpretation. Indeed the very existence of the layers would implicitly define different *types* of relationships for the ego. We simply consider that relationships within a given layer are similar precisely because they have the same cost. Then, the problem we focused on was to compute in how many different ways a given number of actors can be distributed in an ego's network with the above mentioned restrictions. In our setting, once the layers, the total degree and the total social resource are fixed, the hierarchical structure emerges in a natural way, as the number of possible configurations with few strong and many weak links is much higher than configurations made of only strong or weak links. This result suggests that the observed hierarchical structure could be a consequence of the existence of an internal discrete categorization in which individuals organize different types of relationships. However, the reason why those categories or layers would exist in the first place remains unknown and shall be further explored. Another interesting question that arises naturally from our work is how a given number of ego-networks, as the ones generated by our models, can be linked together in a way consistent with the global structure observed in real social networks [29–31]. Solving this *puzzle* would allow us to generate null models for societies compatible with the observed regularities in the ego-networks.

Acknowledgments

M. J.-M. would like to thank Ignacio Morer, and professors Conrad Pérez Vicente and Albert Díaz-Guilera for their inspiring work and encouraging conversations. I. T. would like to thank Angel Sánchez and Robin Dunbar for inspiring conversations and acknowledges partial supporting from the EU through FET-Open Project IBSEN and from Fundación BBVA through project DUNDIG. J. R.-L. acknowledges partial supporting from MINECO through grant FIS2015-69167-C2-1.

Appendix A: Non-degenerate micro-canonical ensemble

In a non-degenerate micro-canonical ensemble, the identity of the alter nodes are interchangeable and configuration states, $\{k_r\}$, are counted once. Thus, the partition function is

$$\Omega_{\rm U} = \sum_{\{k_r\}} \mathrm{e}^{\sum_r h_r k_r} \delta(s - \textstyle\sum_r s_r k_r) \delta(k - \sum_r k_r). \quad \text{(A1)}$$

Again, the Dirac deltas can be expressed in its integral form. The exponent factors over the k_r's, hence product

and sum can be exchanged and the geometric sums over k_r values can be solved.

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{U}} = \int D[\lambda,\mu]\, \mathrm{e}^{-(\lambda k+\mu s)} \sum_{\{k_r\}} \prod_r \mathrm{e}^{(h_r+\lambda+\mu s_r)k_r} \tag{A2a}$$

$$= \int D[\lambda,\mu]\, \exp\left\{-(\lambda k+\mu s) - \textstyle\sum_r \ln\left[1-\mathrm{e}^{h_r+\lambda+\mu s_r}\right]\right\}. \tag{A2b}$$

Then, approximating the integral by steepest descent, we arrive to

$$\ln \Omega_{\mathrm{U}} \approx -(\lambda k+\mu s) - \sum_r \ln\left[1-\mathrm{e}^{h_r+\lambda+\mu s_r}\right]. \tag{A3}$$

After renaming $x = \mathrm{e}^{\lambda}$ and $y = \mathrm{e}^{\mu}$, the saddle point equations read

$$k = \sum_r \frac{x y^{s_r}}{1-x y^{s_r}}, \quad s = \sum_r s_r \frac{x y^{s_r}}{1-x y^{s_r}}. \tag{A4}$$

Finally, the layer degree cumulants are

$$\langle k_r \rangle = \frac{x y^{s_r}}{1-x y^{s_r}}, \tag{A5}$$

$$\sigma^2_{k_r} = \frac{x y^{s_r}}{(1-x y^{s_r})^2}, \tag{A6}$$

$$\sigma_{k_r,k_l} = 0. \tag{A7}$$

In the non-degenerate ensemble, the interpretation of parameter y as the group size scaling does not hold.

Appendix B: Cumulants of a quotient function

The cumulants of a quotient function $r(x,y) = x/y$ cannot be obtained directly from the partition function. However, they can be approximated by expanding $r(x,y)$ around the expected values, $\langle x\rangle$ and $\langle y\rangle$, as done in reference [32]. The mean and variance up to second order are given by

$$\langle r\rangle = \frac{\langle x\rangle}{\langle y\rangle}\left[1 + \frac{\langle y^2\rangle}{\langle y\rangle^2} - \frac{\langle xy\rangle}{\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle}\right], \tag{B1}$$

$$\sigma^2_r = \frac{\langle x\rangle^2}{\langle y\rangle^2}\left[\frac{\langle x^2\rangle}{\langle x\rangle^2} + \frac{\langle y^2\rangle}{\langle y\rangle^2} - \frac{2\langle xy\rangle}{\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle}\right]. \tag{B2}$$

References

[1] R. Dunbar, Journal of Human Evolution **22**, 469 (1992), ISSN 0047-2484.

[2] R. Dunbar, Brain **9**, 178 (1998).

[3] B. Gonçalves, N. Perra, and A. Vespignani, PLoS ONE **6**, 1 (2011).

[4] G. Miritello, R. Lara, M. Cebrian, and E. Moro, Scientific Reports **3**, 1950 EP (2013).

[5] J. Stiller and R. Dunbar, Social Networks **29**, 93 (2007), ISSN 0378-8733.

[6] S. G. B. Roberts and R. I. M. Dunbar, Evolution and Human Behavior **32**, 186 (2011), ISSN 1090-5138.

[7] V. Arnaboldi, A. Guazzini, and A. Passarella, Computer Communications **36**, 1130 (2013), ISSN 0140-3664.

[8] J. Saramäki, E. A. Leicht, E. López, S. G. B. Roberts, F. Reed-Tsochas, and R. I. M. Dunbar, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **111**, 942 (2014).

[9] W.-X. Zhou, D. Sornette, R. A. Hill, and R. I. M. Dunbar, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences **272**, 439 (2005), ISSN 0962-8452.

[10] R. Dunbar, V. Arnaboldi, M. Conti, and A. Passarella, Social Networks **43**, 39 (2015), ISSN 0378-8733.

[11] R. I. M. Dunbar, Behavioral and Brain Sciences **16**, 681–694 (1993).

[12] B. Fuchs, D. Sornette, and S. Thurner, Scientific Reports **4**, 6526 EP (2014), article.

[13] V. Arnaboldi, M. Conti, A. Passarella, and F. Pezzoni, in *Privacy, security, risk and trust (PASSAT), 2012 international conference on and 2012 international confernece on social computing (SocialCom)* (IEEE, 2012), pp. 31–40.

[14] V. Arnaboldi, M. Conti, A. Passarella, and F. Pezzoni, in *INFOCOM, 2013 Proceedings IEEE* (IEEE, 2013), pp. 3459–3464.

[15] P. M. Carron, K. Kaski, and R. Dunbar, Social Networks **47**, 151 (2016), ISSN 0378-8733.

[16] O. Sagarra, C. J. Pérez Vicente, and A. Díaz-Guilera, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 062806 (2013).

[17] T. Squartini, F. Picciolo, F. Ruzzenenti, and D. Garlaschelli, Scientific Reports **3**, e1003374 (2013).

[18] O. Sagarra, C. J. Pérez Vicente, and A. Díaz-Guilera, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 052816 (2015).

[19] A. Antonioni, S. Bullock, and M. Tomassini (2014).

[20] M. Kardar, *Statistical physics of particles* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[21] E. T. Jaynes and G. L. Bretthorst, eds., *Probability theory : the logic of science* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, New York, 2003), ISBN 0-521-59271-2.

[22] J. Park and M. E. J. Newman, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 066117 (2004).

[23] D. Garlaschelli and M. I. Loffredo, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 015101 (2008).

[24] K. Anand and G. Bianconi, Phys. Rev. E **80**, 045102 (2009).

[25] A. Almaatouq, L. Radaelli, A. Pentland, and E. Shmueli, PLoS ONE **11**, 1 (2016).

[26] F. Wang and D. P. Landau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2050

(2001).
[27] R. Fischer, J. C. Leit~ao, T. P. Peixoto, and E. G. Altmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 188701 (2015).
[28] T. Kordsmeyer, P. Mac Carron, and R. Dunbar, Current Anthropology **58**, 000 (2017).
[29] M. S. Granovetter, American Journal of Sociology **78**, 1360 (1973).
[30] J.-P. Onnela, J. Saramäki, J. Hyvönen, G. Szabó, D. Lazer, K. Kaski, J. Kertész, and A.-L. Barabási, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **104**, 7332 (2007).
[31] N. Z. Gong and W. Xu, Social Network Analysis and Mining **4**, 184 (2014), ISSN 1869-5469.
[32] O. Sagarra, F. Font-Clos, C. J. Pérez-Vicente, and A. Díaz-Guilera, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **107**, 38002 (2014).
[33] It is straightforward to generalize a Wang-Landau algorithm to compute a joint bivariate density of states in an integer valued configuration space. The code in python is available at `https://manu-jimenez.github.io/blog/`